

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1-7 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst and Henckel

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst and Henckel. The independent claims in this group, namely claims 1, 7 and 16, have been amended herein to recite that the datastream includes a send mechanism for sending the datastream as well as a receive mechanism for receiving the datastream. Nowhere does De Borst, Henckel, nor their combination teach a datastream that includes both a send mechanism and a receive mechanism. For this reason, claims 1, 7 and 16 are allowable over the combination of De Borst and Henckel. In addition, claims 2-6 depend on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above, and claims 17-20 depend on claim 16, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 2-6 and 17-20 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Rejection of claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst, Henckel and Sosic

The Examiner rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst, Henckel and Sosic. As applicant argued in detail in the Appeal Brief, Sosic has nothing whatsoever to do with datastreams, so the combination of Sosic with De Borst and Henckel would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art. For this reason, the combination of De Borst, Henckel and Sosic is improper under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 8 is amended herein to recite means within the active datastream for sending the active datastream from the first computer system to the second computer

system. Claim 11 is amended herein to recite a datastream send mechanism and a datastream receive mechanism within the active datastream. Nowhere does De Borst, Henckel, Sosic, or their combination teach or suggest an active datastream that includes means or a send mechanism within the datastream for sending the datastream. For this reason, claims 8 and 11 are allowable over the combination of De Borst, Henckel and Sosic. In addition, claims 9 and 10 depend on claim 8, and claims 12-14 depend on claim 11. As a result, claims 9, 10, and 12-14 are also allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Rejection of claims 1-7 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst and Dyer

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst and Dyer. The independent claims in this group, namely claims 1, 7 and 16, have been amended herein to recite that the datastream includes a send mechanism for sending the datastream as well as a receive mechanism for receiving the datastream. Nowhere does De Borst, Dyer, nor their combination teach a datastream that includes both a send mechanism and a receive mechanism. For this reason, claims 1, 7 and 16 are allowable over the combination of De Borst and Dyer. In addition, claims 2-6 depend on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above, and claims 17-20 depend on claim 16, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 2-6 and 17-20 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Rejection of claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst, Dyer and Sosic

The Examiner rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst, Dyer and Sosic. As applicant argued in detail in the Appeal Brief, Sosic has nothing whatsoever to do with datastreams, so the combination of Sosic with De

Borst and Dyer would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art. For this reason, the combination of De Borst, Dyer and Susic is improper under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 8 is amended herein to recite means within the active datastream for sending the active datastream from the first computer system to the second computer system. Claim 11 is amended herein to recite a datastream send mechanism and a datastream receive mechanism within the active datastream. Nowhere does De Borst, Dyer, Susic, or their combination teach or suggest an active datastream that includes means or a send mechanism within the datastream for sending the datastream. For this reason, claims 8 and 11 are allowable over the combination of De Borst, Dyer and Susic. In addition, claims 9 and 10 depend on claim 8, and claims 12-14 depend on claim 11. As a result, claims 9, 10, and 12-14 are also allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Rejection of claims 1-7 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst and Nakano

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst and Nakano. The independent claims in this group, namely claims 1, 7 and 16, have been amended herein to recite that the datastream includes a send mechanism for sending the datastream as well as a receive mechanism for receiving the datastream. Nowhere does De Borst, Nakano, nor their combination teach a datastream that includes both a send mechanism and a receive mechanism. For this reason, claims 1, 7 and 16 are allowable over the combination of De Borst and Nakano. In addition, claims 2-6 depend on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above, and claims 17-20 depend on claim 16, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 2-6 and 17-20 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Rejection of claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst, Nakano and Sasic

The Examiner rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Borst, Nakano and Sasic. As applicant argued in detail in the Appeal Brief, Sasic has nothing whatsoever to do with datastreams, so the combination of Sasic with De Borst and Nakano would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art. For this reason, the combination of De Borst, Nakano and Sasic is improper under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 8 is amended herein to recite means within the active datastream for sending the active datastream from the first computer system to the second computer system. Claim 11 is amended herein to recite a datastream send mechanism and a datastream receive mechanism within the active datastream. Nowhere does De Borst, Nakano, Sasic, or their combination teach or suggest an active datastream that includes means or a send mechanism within the datastream for sending the datastream. For this reason, claims 8 and 11 are allowable over the combination of De Borst, Nakano and Sasic. In addition, claims 9 and 10 depend on claim 8, and claims 12-14 depend on claim 11. As a result, claims 9, 10, and 12-14 are also allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Allowance of claim 15

Claim 15 was allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of this claim.

New claims 21-26

New claims 21-26 are added herein.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Derek P. Martin
Reg. No. 36,595

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700